

ANTOLLINO PLLC, GREGORY ANTOLLINO, Esq., Principal
116 WEST 23RD STREET, STE. 500, NEW YORK, NY 10011
PH: 212-334-7397 Cell: 212-979-6899 GREGORY@ANTOLLINO.COM

December 2, 2021

Ona T. Wang
United States Magistrate Judge
500 Pearl Street
New York, NY 10007

RE: Allen, et al. v. Krucial Staffing, LLC et al., 20-cv-2859(JGK)(OTW)

Dear Magistrate Wang:

I hope you had a Happy Gratitude Day. Mr. Abrams, through Ms. Gasper, sent me a proposed letter to file on the public docket.

I decline to take part in this charade. You have already violated my First Amendment Rights. You have falsely fed the defendants inapplicable disciplinary to impugn my integrity; you have done nothing to investigate my claims of discrimination when – as you stated at one conference – you were insulted that I used the term “Asian” because it failed to include the many Asian communities. I disabused you of this discriminatory assumption to me. I made it clear that you knew not of what you were speaking. I have familiarized my mind with many Asian communities, particularly China and the Koreans.

Further, I was once a caseworker for the City of New York in places like Flushing and Chinatown. I saw Asian poverty. You implied that I did not understand that I knew there was a broader Asian community. Suffice to say – and I’m sure you will not deny it – I disabused you of that notion on two occasions.

Yet despite a credible claim of discrimination that you believe unworthy of investigation – for me, that is – you feel free even to rule on this procedural motion. Plaintiffs have moved that you recuse yourself – in part – because you do not enforce anti-discrimination law in favor of me (and therefore my seven heterosexual Plaintiffs). Yet you have no problem have, in ruling against me one this motion. This disparate treatment and failure to follow anti-discrimination laws is another reason you should recuse yourself. I think these failures should be evident because – as I recall – you teach at the So-Called “Judge School?” (If I am incorrect or imprecise in this characterization, I apologize.)

You also fail to enforce your individual rules equally between the parties. Why was Mr. Abrams not “scolded” for not conferring? Whatever the answer, this is further evidence you are unfair.

You refuse to enforce my clients' rights as equally as these unlimited-pockets defendants.
The defense has not expert fully paid my expert, and you have done nothing to address that.

I refuse to discuss with defense counsel how to limit further my First Amendment Rights – speech rights that you approved, with which I do not use like Cotton Candy. You refuse to place information between these defendants and The City of New York on the public docket. Yet you refuse to look at the correspondence between these parties. You are a Public Official, and you know that the Manhattan District Attorney has (at least in part) investigated the margins of this case. **Yet you protect – in my opinion – the confidentiality of these defendants' communications with The City of New York.** These actions reflect – in my opinion – that you gear your work as a judge as to what is more efficient to you without attention to due process (not to mention the truth).

Your actions appear not to matter to you, and plaintiffs contend that further reflects an appearance of impropriety. Your hostility to placing this public information on the public docket, too, implicates the First Amendment. It reflects your abject misunderstanding of this case and the right of the public to know about these defendants – which the City of New York repays – and to blame it on my desire to seek pretrial publicity. (Say what?)

Therefore, plaintiffs have no response to what they characterize as further evidence of your failure to exercise discretion equally between the parties. (And sorry about the bad poetry, but nothing was getting your honor's attention).

Sincerely,

/s/ Greg S. Antollino

Gregory Antollino

Cc: All parties by ECF